arXiv:1701.04479v1 [math.DG] 16 Jan 2017

On geometric formality of rationally elliptic manifolds in dimensions 6 and 7

Svjetlana Terzić

January 18, 2017

Abstract

We discuss the question of geometric formality for rationally elliptic manifolds of dimension 6 and 7. We prove that a geometrically formal six-dimensional biquotient with $b_2 = 3$ has the real cohomology of a symmetric space. We also show that a rationally hyperbolic six-dimensional manifold with $b_2 \leq 2$ and $b_3 = 0$ can not be geometrically formal. As it follows from their real homotopy classification, the seven-dimensional geometrically formal rationally elliptic manifolds have the real cohomology of symmetric spaces as well. [1]

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Rationally elliptic manifolds and geometric formality **2**

2.1 Notion of geometric formality 2

2.1.1 Relation between rational formality and geometric formality . 4

2.2 Rationally elliptic manifolds and geometric formality 4

2.2.1 Five-dimensional rationally elliptic manifolds 6

3 Six-dimensional rationally elliptic manifolds **6**

3.1 On some hyperbolic six-dimensional manifolds 10

4 Seven-dimensional rationally elliptic manifolds **11**

[1] MSC 2000: 53C25, 53C30

1 Introduction

The notion of geometric formality of a closed compact manifold M is related to an existence of a metric g on M such that the exterior product of harmonic forms are again harmonic forms. It is proved in [14] that a geometrically formal manifold of dimension ≤ 4 has the real cohomology of a symmetric space. Afterwards this notion has been further studied and there were provided many examples of non -geometrically formal homogeneous spaces [16] [17],[7], but also the examples of geometrically formal homogeneous spaces which are not homotopy symmetric spaces [17]. The notion of geometric formality has also been studied from the point of view of its relation to the different positive curvatures [2], [1].

In this note we investigate the question of geometric formality of rationally elliptic manifolds in small dimensions. The reason for considering rationally elliptic manifolds is that a rationally hyperbolic manifold has a lot relations in its real cohomology algebra related to the number of generators, which very often may appear as an obstruction to geometric formality. Beside that, the same estimation on the Betti numbers that holds for the rationally elliptic manifolds holds geometrically formal manifolds as well.

From the classification of the rationally elliptic manifolds in dimensions five and seven it directly follows that any such geometrically formal manifold has the real cohomology of a symmetric space. In dimension six we consider the biquotients for which $b_2 = 3$ and prove that any such geometrically formal biquotient has the real cohomology algebra of a symmetric space. We also show that a rationally hyperbolic six-dimensional manifold with $b_2 \leq 2$ and $b_3 = 0$ can not be geometrically formal.

2 Rationally elliptic manifolds and geometric formality

2.1 Notion of geometric formality

Let (M, g) be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold and $\Omega^*(M)$ its de Rham algebra of differential forms. A differential form $\omega \in \Omega^k(M)$ is said to be harmonic if $\Delta\omega = d\delta\omega + \delta d\omega = (d+\delta)^2\omega = 0$, where d is the exterior derivative, δ is coderivative and Δ is the Laplace-de Rham operator. To recall this in more detail, let $\langle , \rangle : \Omega^k(M) \to \mathbb{R}$ be the scalar product in the space of differential forms:

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \int_M g(\alpha_x, \beta_x) dvol_g \ .$$

The Hodge star operator $* : \Omega^k(M) \to \Omega^{n-k}(M)$, $n = \dim M$, is defined by $\alpha \wedge * \beta = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle dvol_g$. Then for $\alpha \in \Omega^{k-1}$ and $\beta \in \Omega^k$ it holds $\langle d\alpha, \beta \rangle = (-1)^k \langle \alpha, (*^{-1} d *) \beta \rangle$. It implies that the operator $\delta = (-1)^k *^{-1} d *$ is conjugate to d in the space of k - forms.

Denote by $\Upsilon(M, g) \subseteq \Omega^*(M)$ the graded linear subspace of harmonic forms. It is well known that any harmonic form is closed and no harmonic form is exact. Besides that the Hodge theorem states that any cohomology class $[\omega] \in H^*(M, \mathbb{R})$ contains unique,

up to constant, harmonic representative. Thus, there exists the isomorphism between the graded vector spaces $\Upsilon(M,g)$ and $H^*(M,\mathbb{R})$.

It naturally arises the question about the existence of the metric g on M such that the exterior product $\wedge$ gives the algebra structure on $\Upsilon(M,g)$. For a such metric the algebras $(\Upsilon(M,g),\wedge)$ and $(H^*(M,\mathbb{R}),\wedge)$ are isomorphic. This is defined in [14]:

Definition 1. A Riemannian metric g on M is said to be formal if the exterior product of its harmonic forms are harmonic forms.

Definition 2. A closed Riemannian manifold M is said to be geometrically formal if it admits a formal Riemannian metric.

The following examples of geometrically formal manifolds are well known: real cohomology spheres are geometrically formal since they have, up to constant, just one harmonic form; symmetric spaces G/H are geometrically formal related to an invariant metric g. This follows from the observations [3] that any G-invariant form on a symmetric space G/H is closed and none is exact. Besides that invariant forms $\Omega^G(G/H)$ form an algebra related to the exterior product. Since harmonic forms for na invariant metric g are G- invariant it implies that $\Omega^G(G/H)$ coincide with $\Upsilon(G/H,g)$ and, thus, $(\Upsilon(G/H,g),\wedge)$ is an algebra.

We found useful to note the following:

Lemma 1. *Assume that the manifold M is not geometrically formal. Then the product $M\times N$ can not be geometrically formal for any closed manifold N.*

Proof. Let $M\times N$ be a geometrically formal manifold for some closed manifold N and let g be a formal metric on $M\times N$. Then the metric g_M obtained by the restriction of the metric g to the manifold M is also formal. To see that let α be a harmonic form on M related to the metric g_M and $*_M$ the corresponding star operator. Then α is a harmonic form on $M\times N$ related to the metric g. Namely, on $M\times N$ we have $*\alpha = *_M\alpha\wedge\gamma$, where γ is a harmonic volume form on N related to the metric g_N. It implies $d(*\alpha) = d(*_M\alpha)\wedge\gamma \pm *_M\alpha\wedge d(\gamma) = 0$, since obviously $d(\gamma)=0$ and $d(*_M\alpha)=0$. Therefore if α and β are harmonic forms on M then $\alpha\wedge\beta$ is harmonic form on $M\times N$. The restriction of $\alpha\wedge\beta$ on M is the same form, so it follows that $\alpha\wedge\beta$ is a harmonic form on M and the metric g_M is formal, what is the contradiction. □

Remark 1. Let us point on one useful observation. Assume that a manifold M is geometrically formal and consider its cohomology ring $H^*(M,\mathbb{R})$ with its generators and relations. Choose harmonic form in each generator for $H^*(M,\mathbb{R})$. Then these harmonic forms satisfy the same relations as the corresponding generators in $H^*(M,R)$. In many cases the existence of such forms leads to the contradiction meaning that the cohomology structure is often an obstruction to geometric formality.

2.1.1 Relation between rational formality and geometric formality

Definition 3. A manifold M is formal in the sense of rational homotopy theory if $\Omega^*(M)$ is weakly equivalent to $H^*(M,\mathbb{R})$:

$$(\Omega^*(M),d) \leftarrow (C,d) \rightarrow (H^*(M),d=0), \tag{1}$$

where the both homomorphisms induce isomorphisms in cohomology.

The first well known examples of formal spaces are manifolds having free cohomology algebras, then Kaehler manifolds, compact symmetric spaces, etc. Note that the first proof of formality of compact symmetric spaces is based on the fact we already recalled that an invariant metric on a compact symmetric space is formal. Thus, in this case to prove formality one can take $(C,d) = (\Upsilon(G/H),0)$ in (1), where $\Upsilon(G/H)$ is an algebra of harmonic forms related to an invariant metric.

Besides that it is known : all homogeneous spaces G/H with $\operatorname{rk} H = \operatorname{rk} G$ are formal [19], all closed simply connected manifolds of dimension ≤ 6 are formal [18], all closed simply connected 7-dimensional manifolds M with $b_2(M) \leq 1$ are formal [12].

Remark 2. A geometrically formal manifold M is formal:

$$(\Omega(M),d) \leftarrow (\Upsilon(M),d) \rightarrow (H^*(M),d=0).$$

The vice versa is not true. For example, it is proved in [16] that the full flag manifolds $SU(n+1)/T^n$ are not geometrically formal, although they are formal since $\operatorname{rk} SU(n+1) = \operatorname{rk} T^n = n$. Moreover, none of the complete flag manifolds of a simple compact Lie group is geometrically formal, although they are all formal. For the classical Lie groups and G_2 this is proved in [16] and for the exceptional Lie groups in [7],. For all these spaces their cohomology ring structure is an obstruction for geometric formality. On the other hand, in [17] are provided the series of Stiefel manifolds for which it is proved to be geometrically formal and not homotopy equivalent to a symmetric space.

2.2 Rationally elliptic manifolds and geometric formality

Let X be a simply connected topological space of finite type, that is $dim H_k(X) < \infty$ for any k .

Definition 4. X is said to be rationally elliptic if $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi_*(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is finite and it is said to be rationally hyperbolic if $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi_*(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is infinite.

Example 1. The compact homogeneous spaces of positive Euler characteristic and the biquotients of compact Lie groups are rationally elliptic spaces, see [5].

The ranks of the homotopy groups of a rationally elliptic space X, $\dim X = n$ satisfy:

$$\sum_k 2k \cdot \operatorname{rk} \pi_{2k}(X) \leq n, \quad \sum_k (2k+1) \cdot \operatorname{rk} \pi_{2k+1}(X) \leq 2n-1. \tag{2}$$

We want to consider the question of geometric formality, or more precisely the weaker question of the real cohomology structure of geometrically formal manifolds, for rationally elliptic spaces. Why to consider rationally elliptic spaces?

The first reason comes from the fact that the Betti numbers of a geometrically formal manifold M satisfy [14]:

$$b_i(M) \leq b_i(T^{\dim M}),\ 1 \leq i \leq dimM.$$

It implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\dim M} b_i(M) \leq 2^{\dim M}. \tag{3}$$

On the other hand, it is known [5] that the Betti numbers of a rationally elliptic space X satisfy the inequality (3) as well.

The second reason is that a rationally hyperbolic space has a lot relations in its real cohomology algebra related to the number of generators. Namely, the rational homotopy groups of a simply connected space are given by the numbers of the generators of the corresponding degree in the minimal model of the space. Let us recall [5] that a free algebra $(\wedge V, d)$ is said to be a minimal model for a commutative differential graded algebra $(\mathcal{A}, d_{\mathcal{A}})$ if $d(V) \subset \wedge^{\geq 2} V$ and there exists a morphism $f : (\wedge V, d) \to (\mathcal{A}, d_{\mathcal{A}})$, which induces an isomorphism in cohomology. The minimal model $\mu(M) = (\wedge V, d)$ of a compact simply connected manifold M is the minimal model of its de Rham algebra of differential forms $\Omega(M)$. It is known that: $\mu(M)$ is unique up to isomorphism and it classifies the rational homotopy type of M, $\mu(M)$ contains complete information on the ranks of the homotopy groups of M and if M is a rationally formal manifold then $\mu(M)$ coincides with the minimal model for $(H^*(M, \mathbb{Q}), d = 0)$. Therefore, for a simply connected formal space its minimal model can be obtained from its cohomology algebra. One just starts, see [5], with the cohomology generators of degree two and builds up the minimal model by adding the generators of higher degree to eliminate the cohomology relations and keep freeness of the minimal model. In this way we see that, for a rationally hyperbolic manifold M, the number of relations in $H^*(M, R)$ is quite large comparing to the number of generators in $H^*(M, \mathbb{R})$, as $\mu(M)$ has infinite number of generator, Therefore, taking into account Remark 1, the rationally hyperbolic spaces are hardly to expect to admit a formal metric.

From the side of geometry, it is conjectured by Gromov [8] that the estimation (3) holds for positively curved manifolds, while there is also conjecture by Bott [9] that a simply connected manifold which admit a metric of non-negative sectional curvature is rationally elliptic. This brought attention to the study of the connection between positive curvature and geometric formality. In that context the following results are known.

- It is proved in [2] that for a simply connected compact oriented Riemannian manifold M which is geometrically formal and has non-negative sectional curvature one of the following holds: M is homeomorphic to S^4, M is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^2$ or M is isometric to $S^2 \times S^2$ with product metric, where both spaces carry metrics with positive curvature.

- A homogeneous geometrically formal metric of positive curvature is either symmetric or a metric on a rationally homology sphere, see [1].
- The normal homogeneous metric on Alloff-Wallach spaces is not geometrically formal [17] , but it is not positively curved as well. It is proved in [1] that no other homogeneous metric is geometrically formal as well.

Remark 3. We further discuss the notion of geometric formality for the rationally elliptic manifolds whose dimension is ≥ 5, because of the more general result of [14] which states that a closed oriented geometrically formal manifold of dimension ≤ 4 has the real cohomology algebra of a compact globally symmetric space.

2.2.1 Five-dimensional rationally elliptic manifolds

The following results are known:

- All five-dimensional simply connected rationally elliptic manifolds have the rational homotopy type of S^5 or $S^2 \times S^3$ ([20], [23]);
- There are four types of diffeomorphic five-dimensional biquotients:

$$S^5, \;\; S^2 \times S^3, \;\; X_{-1} = SU(3)/SO(3), \;\; X_\infty.$$

The manifolds X_{-1} and X_∞ are obtained by gluing two copies of non-trivial three dimensional bundles over S^2 along the common boundary $\mathbb{C}P^2 \# \mathbb{C}P^2$. The Wu manifold X_{-1} is cohomology real cohomology sphere S^5, while $H^*(X_\infty, \mathbb{R}) = H^*(S^2 \times S^3, \mathbb{R})$.

Thus, all geometrically formal five-dimensional simply connected rationally elliptic manifolds have the real cohomology of a symmetric space. Among biquotients, $S^5, S^2 \times S^3$ and X_{-1} are geometrically formal, while for X_∞ it is for us an open question.

3 Six-dimensional rationally elliptic manifolds

The second Betti number of the six-dimensional rationally elliptic manifolds is by (2) less or equal 3 . The following results are known about their real homotopy:

- All six-dimensional rationally elliptic manifold with $b_2 \leq 1$ have the real cohomology of S^6, $S^3 \times S^3$, $S^2 \times S^4$ and $\mathbb{C}P^3$ ([13], [22]).
- All six-dimensional rationally elliptic manifold with $b_2 = 2$ have the real homotopy type of $\mathbb{C}P^2 \times S^2$, $SU(3)/T^2$ or $\mathbb{C}P^3 \# \mathbb{C}P^3$ ([13]).
- All six dimensional rationally elliptic manifolds with $b_2 = 3$ have the rational homotopy groups of $S^2 \times S^2 \times S^2$ ([22]),

The first result on real cohomology structure of the geometrically formal rationally elliptic six-manifolds for which $b_2 \leq 2$ is as follows [22]:

Proposition 1. *All geometrically formal six-dimensional rationally elliptic manifolds with $b_2 \leq 2$ have the real cohomology of a symmetric space.*

Corollary 1. *The manifolds $SU(3)/T^2$ and $\mathbb{C}P^3\#\mathbb{C}P^3$ are not geometrically formal.*

We discuss here the question of geometric formality for some six-dimensional biquotients for which $b_2 = 3$. It is proved [10] that a reduced compact simply connected six-dimensional biquotient $G//H$ satisfies one of the following: it is

1. diffeomorphic to a homogeneous spaces or Eschenburg inhomogeneous flag manifold $SU(3)//T^1$;
2. decomposable;
3. diffeomorphic to $S^5 \times_{T^2} S^3$ or $(S^3)^3//T^3$.

None of the homogeneous spaces of dimension 6 is geometrically formal neither it is Eschenburg inhomogeneous flag manifold $SU(3)//T^1$. As it is proved in [16], their cohomology structure is an obstruction to geometric formality.

We analyze now the following decomposable biquotients: three $\mathbb{C}P^2$ bundles over S^2, infinitely many S^2 bundles with base a 4-dimensional biquotient - S^4, $\mathbb{C}P^2$, $S^2 \times S^2$, $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\mathbb{C}P^2$, $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P^2}$.

Lemma 2. *All three $\mathbb{C}P^2$ bundles over S^2 have the real cohomology of $\mathbb{C}P^2 \times S^2$, that is of a symmetric space.*

Proof. Any $\mathbb{C}P^2$- bundle E over S^2 is obtained as the projectivisation of rank three complex vector bundle over S^2. Therefore, the integral cohomology of its total space M is generated by two generators x and y of degree 2 subject to the relations

$$x^2 = 0, \;\; y^3 + c_1 x y^2 = 0.$$

If we put $y_1 = y + \frac{c_1}{3}x$ then x and y_1 generate the real cohomology ring of M and satisfy the relations $x^2 = 0$, $y_1^2 \neq 0$, $y_1^3 = 0$ and $xy_1^2 = y^2 x \neq 0$. □

Note that the cohomology structure can not be obstruction for geometric formality of any of these bundles. The trivial bundle $S^2 \times \mathbb{C}P^2$ is geometrically formal, while for the other two bundles we can remark that if some of them admits a formal metric it admits a symplectic structure as well.

It is proved in [16] that any of the infinitely many S^2 bundle over $\mathbb{C}P^2$ is geometrically formal if and only if it is a trivial bundle $S^2 \times \mathbb{C}P^2$. Applying the same argument as it is done in [16] for these family of bundles, we prove the following:

Theorem 1. *None of the infinitely many S^2-bundles over $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\mathbb{C}P^2$ is geometrically formal.*

Proof. Let M be the total space of a S^2- bundle E over $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\mathbb{C}P^2$. It is obtained as the projectivisation of rank 2 complex vector bundle V. Therefore the integral cohomology of M is given by $H^*(M) = H^*(\mathbb{C}P^2\#\mathbb{C}P^2, \mathbb{Z})[y]$ subject to the relation

$$y^2 + c_1(E)y + c_2(E) = 0, \tag{4}$$

where $c_1(E)$ and $c_2(E)$ are the pull backs of the first and second Chern classes from $H^*((\mathbb{C}P^2\#\mathbb{C}P^2, \mathbb{Z})$. The cohomology ring $H^*(\mathbb{C}P^2\#\mathbb{C}P^2, \mathbb{Z})$ has two generators x_1, x_2 of degree 2 satisfying relation $x_1^2 = x_2^2$, $x_1x_2 = 0$ and $x_1^3 = 0$. The relation (4) writes as

$$y^2 + (ax_1 + bx_2)y + cx_1^2 = 0 \text{ for } a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Let $z = y + \frac{a}{2}x_1 + \frac{b}{2}x_2$, then $z^2 = y^2 + (ax_1 + bx_2)y + \frac{a^2+b^2}{4}x_1^2$. It follows that

$$z^2 + dx_1^2 = 0, \text{ where } d = c - \frac{a^2 + b^2}{4}. \tag{5}$$

and x_1, x_2, z are the cohomology generators for the real cohomology ring $H^*(M, \mathbb{R})$. We obtain that $z^2x_1 = z^2x_2 = 0$ and $z^3 = -dzx_1^2 = -dzx_2^2$, what implies that zx_1^2 is top degree cohomology class.

Assume that M is geometrically formal. Let ω and η be the harmonic representatives for x_1 and z respectively. Since $\omega_1^2 = 0$ it follows that the kernel foliation of ω_1 is at least two-dimensional. Let v_1, v_2 be the basis vectors of this foliation. From (5) it follows $2i_{v_1}\eta\eta = 0$.

If $d \neq 0$ then $\eta^3 = -d\eta\omega_1^2$ is a volume form on M. But, $i_{v_1}(\eta^3) = 2i_{v_1}\eta\eta^2 = 0$, what is the contradiction.

If $d = 0$ then $4c = a^2 + b^2$, what implies that the integers a and b are even. It further implies that $w_2(V) = c_1(V) \pmod 2 = 0$ and $p_1(V) = c_1^2(E) - 4c_2(E) = (a^2 + b^2 - 4c)x_1^2 = 0$. Therefore, by [21], [11] the bundle E is trivial and $M = S^2 \times (\mathbb{C}P^2\#\mathbb{C}P^2)$. The connected sum $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\mathbb{C}P^2$ is not geometrically formal, since it is known not to admit a symplectic structure. It follows by Lemma 1 that M is not geometrically formal as well.

□

Theorem 2. *None of the infinitely many S^2-bundles over $S^2 \times S^2$ which does not have the real cohomology of $(S^2)^3$ is geometrically formal.*

Proof. As previously, the total space M of a bundle E is obtained by projectivisation of rank 2 complex vector bundle V. The integral cohomology of M is given by $H^*(M) = H^*(S^2 \times S^2, \mathbb{Z})[y]$ subject to the relation:

$$y^2 + (ax_1 + bx_2)y + cx_1x_2 = 0 \text{ for } a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{6}$$

where x_1, x_2 are the pull backs of the generators of the cohomology ring $H^*(S^2 \times S^2, \mathbb{Z})$ and they satisfy relations $x_1^2 = x_2^2 = 0$. Let $z = y + \frac{a}{2}x_1 + \frac{b}{2}x_2$. Then x_1, x_2 and z represent the generators for $H^*(M, \mathbb{R})$ and in terms of these generators the relation (6) writes as

$$z^2 + qx_1x_2 = 0, \tag{7}$$

where $q = c - \frac{ab}{2}$. Since $z^2x_1 = z^2x_2 = 0$ we conclude that x_1x_2z is non-zero top-degree cohomology class on M.

Assume that M is geometrically formal and let ω, η_1 and η_2 be the harmonic representatives for z, x_1 and x_2. We have that $\eta_1^2 = \eta_2^2 = 0$, what implies that there exist linearly independent vector fields v_1 and v_2 in the intersection of the kernel foliations for η_1 and η_2. It follows from (7) that $i_{v_1,v_2}\omega^2 = 0$, so $\omega^2\eta_1$ and $\omega^2\eta_2$ can not be the volume forms on M. Thus, the volume form must be $\omega\eta_1\eta_2$.

If $q \neq 0$ in (7) then it is easy to see that M does not have the real cohomology of $S^2 \times S^2 \times S^2$. The assumption that M is geometrically formal implies that ω^3 is a volume form on M as well, what is in contradiction with the fact $i_{v_1,v_2}\omega^2 = 0$.

If $q = 0$ then M has the real cohomology of $S^2 \times S^2 \times S^2$. In this case we have that $ab = 2c$, what implies that $p_1(V) = c_1^2(E) - 4c_2(E) = (ax_1 + bx_2)^2 - 4cx_1x_2 = 0$. If the both integers a and b are even then $w_2(V) = 0$ what implies that the bundle E is trivial, that is $M = S^2 \times S^2 \times S^2$, what is geometrically formal symmetric space.

□

Theorem 3. *None of the infinitely many S^2-bundles over $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P^2}$ which does not have the cohomology of $(S^2)^3$ is geometrically formal.*

Proof. Let M be the total space of a S^2- bundle E over $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P^2}$. The real cohomology ring for $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P^2}$ is the same as for $S^2 \times S^2$. Therefore, as in the proof of previous theorem, we conclude that if M does not have the real cohomology of $S^2 \times S^2 \times S^2$ then M can not be geometrically formal.

Let $c_1(E) = ax_1 + bx_2$ and $c_2(E) = cx_1^2$ are the the pullbacks of the first and the second Chern classes for E, where x_1 and x_2 are the generators for $H^*(\mathbb{C}P^2\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P^2}, \mathbb{Z})$. Then, as previously, the real cohomology ring for M is also generated with x_1, x_2 and z such that $z^2 + dx_1^2 = 0$, where $d = c - \frac{a^2-b^2}{4}$. It implies that M has the real cohomology of $(S^2)^3$ if and only if $4c = a^2 - b^2$. In this case $p_1(V) = 0$ and also the integers a and b are of the same parity. If the both a and b are even then $w_2(V) = 0$ and the bundle E is trivial, that is $M = S^2 \times (\mathbb{C}P^2\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P^2})$. It is proved in [15] that $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P^2}$ admits no formal metric, what implies that M is not geometrically formal. □

Corollary 2. *None of the biquotients from the infinite families of the six-dimensional biquotients of the form $(SU(2))^3//T^3$ is geometrically formal.*

Proof. The six-dimensional biquotients of the form $SU(2)^3//T^3$ are classified in [10]. They are given by the three families of infinite matrices and four sporadic matrices. In the same paper it is established which of these biquotients that correspond to these matrices are diffeomorphic. For the biquotients considered in [23] which give one family of these biquotients and whose real cohomology ring has three generators x_1, x_2, x_3 subject to the relations $x_1^2 = 0,\ ax_1x_2 + x_2^2 + x_2x_3 = 0,\ bx_1x_3 + 2x_2x_3 + x_3^2 = 0$, it is proved in [17] that they are not geometrically formal. We want to remark that, as it is pointed in [10], these biquotients are decomposable meaning that any of them can be obtained as S^2 bundle over $S^2 \times S^2$ or as S^2 bundle over $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P^2}$, so Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 provide the new proof that they are not geometrically formal. The other

family of these biquotients has the real cohomology ring generated by x_1, x_2, x_3 subject to the relations $x_1^2 = 0,\ x_2^2 + bx_1x_2 = 0,\ x_3^2 + c_1x_1x_3 + c_2x_2x_x = 0$. This family is considered in [22], where it is proved that these biquotients are not geometrically formal. The third family of biquotients has the real cohomology generators x_1, x_2, x_3 subject to the relations $x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2 = 0,\ x_2^2 + x_1x_2 = 0,\ x_3^2 + c_1x_1x_3 + c_2x_2x_3 = 0$. For this family it is proved in [10] that they are decomposable meaning that they can be represented as S^2 bundles over $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\mathbb{C}P^2$, so Theorem 1 proves that they are not geometrically formal. □

Remark 4. Note that the biquotients from Corollary 2 belong to the third case in the description of six-dimensional biquotients that is given in [10]. This condition also describes the manifold $\mathbb{C}P^3\#\mathbb{C}P^3$.

3.1 On some hyperbolic six-dimensional manifolds

We show that none of the hyperbolic, closed, simply-connected six-dimensional manifolds for which $b_2(M) \leq 2$ and $b_3(M) = 0$ can be geometrically formal because of its cohomology structure. For such a manifold it is known [13] that it is rationally hyperbolic if and only if it has the real homotopy type of $(S^2 \times S^4)\#\mathbb{C}P^3$ or $(S^2 \times S^4)\#(S^2 \times S^4)$.

Proposition 2. *A manifold having real cohomology structure of $(S^2 \times S^4)\#\mathbb{C}P^3$ or $(S^2 \times S^4)\#(S^2 \times S^4)$ can not be geometrically formal.*

Proof. The manifold $(S^2 \times S^4)\#\mathbb{C}P^3$ has three cohomology generators x, y, z, such that $\deg x = \deg z = 2$ and $\deg y = 4$ and $x^2 = 0$, $xz^2 = yz = 0$. Note that the fourth Betti number for $(S^2 \times S^4)\#\mathbb{C}P^3$ is 2, what implies that $xz = ay + bz^2$ Assume that this manifold is geometrically formal, then we have harmonic forms α, β and γ representing the classes x, y, z respectively, which satisfy the same relations as these classes. Since $\alpha^2 = 0$ this form have four-dimensional kernel foliation. Denote by v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 linearly independent vector of this foliation. Since $\alpha\gamma^2 = 0$ we obtain that $0 = i_{v_1,v_2,v_3,v_4}(\alpha\gamma^2) = \alpha\gamma^2(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$ what implies that $\gamma^2(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$=0. On the other hand since $\alpha\gamma = a\beta + b\gamma^2$, it follows that

$$0 = i_{v_1,v_2,v_3.v_4}(\alpha\gamma) = a\beta(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) + b\gamma^2(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = a\beta(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4).$$

It follows that $\beta(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = 0$ or $a = 0$. The first is in contradiction with the fact that $\alpha\beta$ is a volume form. If $a = 0$ we obtain $\alpha\gamma = b\gamma^2$ what implies $0 = \alpha\gamma^2 = b\gamma^3$. Therefore, since γ^3 is a volume form we obtain $b = 0$, what gives $\alpha\gamma = 0$. Thus $0 = i_{v_i,v_j}(\alpha\gamma) = \alpha\gamma(v_i, v_j)$, what implies $\gamma(v_i, v_j) = 0$. It further gives

$$i_{v_1,v_2,v_3,v_4}(\gamma^3) = i_{v_2,v_3,v_4}(3i_{v_1}(\gamma)\gamma^2) = 3i_{v_3,v_4}(\gamma(v_1, v_2)\gamma^2) - 2i_{v_1}(\gamma)i_{v_2}(\gamma)\gamma) =$$

$$-6i_{v_4}(\gamma(v_1, v_3) - i_{v_1}(\gamma)(\gamma(v_2, v_3)\gamma - i_{v_2}(\gamma)i_{v_3}(\gamma)) = -6i_{v_4}(i_{v_1}\gamma i_{v_2}\gamma i_{v_3}\gamma) = 0.$$

This is in contradiction with the fact that γ^3 is a volume form.

The manifold $(S^2 \times S^4)\#(S^2 \times S^4)$ has four cohomology generators x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 such that $\deg x_1 = \deg x_2 = 2$ and $\deg y_1 = \deg y_2 = 4$, which satisfy relations $x_1^2 = x_2^2 = 0$ and $x_1 y_2 = x_2 y_1 = 0$. Since the fourth Betti number b_4 for this manifold is 2 it follows that $x_1 x_2 = a y_1 + b y_2$. If this manifold is geometrically formal, we would have that the harmonic forms α_1 and α_2, which represent the cohomology classes x_1 and x_2, satisfy $\alpha_1^2 = \alpha_2^2 = 0$. Therefore, the kernel foliations for α_1 and α_2 are four-dimensional. We denote their basis by v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 and u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 respectively.

Let β_1 and β_2 be harmonic representatives for y_1 and y_2. Since $\alpha_1\beta_2 = 0$ and $\alpha_2\beta_1 = 0$ we obtain that $\beta_2(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = 0$ and $\beta_1(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) = 0$. We also have that $(\alpha_1\alpha_2)(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = 0$ and $(\alpha_1\alpha_2)(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) = 0$ what implies that $a\beta_1(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = 0$ and $b\beta_2(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) = 0$. Since $\alpha_1\beta_1$ and $\alpha_2\beta_2$ are volume forms we have that $\beta_1(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) \neq 0$ and $\beta_2(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) \neq 0$. It implies that $a = b = 0$ meaning that $\alpha_1\alpha_2 = 0$.

The intersection of the kernel foliations for α_1 and α_2 is at least two-dimensional with the basis say v_1, v_2. We obtain that $0 = i_{v_3,v_4}(\alpha_1\alpha_2) = \alpha_2(v_3, v_4)\alpha_1$ what gives $\alpha_2(v_3, v_4) = 0$. Therefore, $(\alpha_2\beta_2)(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, v_3, v_4) = \alpha_2(v_3, v_4)\beta_2(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) = 0$, what is in contradiction with the fact that $\alpha_2\beta_2$ is a volume form. □

4 Seven-dimensional rationally elliptic manifolds

It is proved in [13] that a closed simply-connected seven-dimensional manifold is rationally elliptic if and only if it has the real homotopy type of one of the following manifolds : S^7, $S^2 \times S^5$, $\mathbb{C}P^2 \times S^3$, $S^3 \times S^4$, N^7, $S^3 \times (\mathbb{C}P^2 \# \mathbb{C}P^2)$ or $S^3 \times (\mathbb{C}P^2 \# \overline{\mathbb{C}P^2})$.

The manifolds S^7, $S^2 \times S^5$, $\mathbb{C}P^2 \times S^3$ and $S^3 \times S^4$ are obviously geometrically formal. But, vice versa is not true. The Allof-Wallach spaces $SU(3)/T^1$ have the real cohomology of $S^2 \times S^5$, but the normal homogeneous metrics on these spaces are not formal [17]. This result, as we already mentioned, is recently strengthened in [1], where it is proved that none of the homogeneous metrics on Allof-Wallach spaces can be geometrically formal.

The manifold N^7 is a homogeneous space $(SU(2))^3/T^2$, where the embedding $T^2 \subset (SU(2))^3$ is given by

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & z^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} w & 0 \\ 0 & w^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} zw & 0 \\ 0 & (zw)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

The real cohomology algebra for N^7 is as follows:

$$\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2] \otimes \wedge(y_1, y_2, y_3), dx_1 = dx_2 = 0, dy_1 = x_1^2, dy_2 = x_2^2, dy_3 = (x_1 + x_2)^2,$$

where $\deg x_1 = \deg x_2 = 2$. It follows that N^7 is not Cartan pair homogeneous space and, thus, not formal in the sense of rational homotopy theory [19]. Therefore, it can not be geometrically formal.

The manifolds $S^3 \times (\mathbb{C}P^2 \# \mathbb{C}P^2)$ and $S^3 \times (\mathbb{C}P^2 \# \overline{\mathbb{C}P^2})$ are also not geometrically formal since, otherwise, it would by Lemma 1 imply that the connected sums

$\mathbb{C}P^2\#\mathbb{C}P^2$ and $\mathbb{C}P^2\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P^2}$ are geometrically formal what is, as we already noted, not the case.

References

[1] M. Amann and W.Ziller, *Geometrically formal metrics of positive sectional curvature*, Journal of Geometric Analysis **26** (2016), 996-1010.

[2] C. Baer, *Geometrically formal* 4*-manifolds with nonnegative sectional curvature*, Communication in Analysis and Geometry, **23** (2015), no. 3, 479 - 497.

[3] B. A. Dubrovin, A. T. Fomenko and S. P. Novikov, *Modern Geometry — Methods and Applications*, Vol. III, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 124, Springer Verlag 1990.

[4] J. H. Eschenburg, *Cohomology of biquotients*, Manuscripta Mathematica **75** (1992), 151–166.

[5] Y. Felix, S. Halperin and J. C. Thomas, *Rational Homotopy Theory*, Springer Verlag, 2000.

[6] Y. Felix, J. Oprea and D. Tanre, *Algebraic Models in Geometry*, Oxford University Press, 2008.

[7] L. Grama, C. J. C. Negreiros and A. R. Oliveira, *Invariant almost complex geometry on flag manifolds: geometric formality and Chern numbers*, Annali di Matematica (2016). doi:10.1007/s10231-016-0568-5.

[8] M. Gromov, *Curvature, diametar and Betti numbers*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **56** (1981), 179-195.

[9] K. Grove and S. Halperin, *Contributions of rational homotopy theorey to global problems in geometry*, Publ. Math. IHES, **56**, (1982), 171-177.

[10] J. DeVito, *The classification of compact simply connected biquotients in dimension 6 and 7*, to appear in Mathematische Annalen, (2016) arXiv:1403.6087.

[11] A. Dold, H. Whitney, *Classification of oriented sphere bundles over* 4*-complex*, Ann. of Math. (2) **69** (1959), 667–677.

[12] M. Fernández, S. Ivanov and V. Munoz, *Formality of* 7*-dimensional* 3*-Sasakian manifolds*, (2015), arXiv:1511.08930.

[13] M. Herrmann, *Classification and characterization of rationally elliptic manifolds in lowl dimensions*, (2015), arXiv:1409.8036.

[14] D. Kotschick, *On products of harmonic forms*, Duke Mathematical Journal **107** (2001), no. 3, 521–532.

[15] D. Kotschick, *Geometric formality and non-negative scalar curvature*, arXiv:1212.3317, (2013).

[16] D. Kotschick and S. Terzić, *On formality of generalised symmetric spaces*, Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society **134** (2003), 491–505.

[17] D. Kotschick and S. Terzić, *On geometric formality of homogeneous spaces and of biquotients*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **249** (2011), no. 1, 157–176.

[18] T. Miller, J. Neisendorfer, *Formal and coformal spaces*, Illinois Journal of Mathematics, **22** (1978), 565–580.

[19] A. L. Onishchik, *Topology of transitive transformation groups* (Russian), Fizmatlit Nauka Moscow 1995.

[20] A. V. Pavlov, *Five-dimensional biquotients*, Siberian Mathematical Journal, **45** (2004), no. 6, 1080 - 1083.

[21] L. Pontrjagin, *Classification of some skew products*, C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. URSS (N. S.) **47** (1945), 322–325.

[22] S. Terzić, *Geometric formality of rationally elliptic manifolds in small dimensions*, Glasnik of the Section of Natural Sciences, Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts, **20** (2014), 131-145.

[23] B. Totaro, *Curvature, diameter, and quotient manifolds*, Mathematical Research Letters **10** (2003), 191–203.

Svjetlana Terzić
Faculty of Science, University of Montenegro
Dzordza Vasingtona bb, 81000 Podgorica, Montenegro
E-mail: sterzic@ac.me